

Comments on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Chiton lepidus* Reuss, 1860 (currently *Lepidochitona lepida*; Mollusca, Polyplacophora)
(Case 3156; see BZN 57: 207–209)

(1) Philippe Bouchet

Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 55 Rue de Buffon, F-75005 Paris, France

The purpose of the application by Enrico Schwabe is to conserve the name *Lepidochitona lepida* (Reuss, 1860) despite it being a junior primary homonym of *Chiton lepidus* Gould, 1859. The name *Lepidochitona lepida* relates to a fossil species from the Miocene of Europe; in the last 100 years it has been used in only nine publications by six independent authors (one of these publications is a catalogue of available names and does not critically evaluate the systematics of the taxon involved). Under these circumstances I consider that the name *Chiton lepidus* Reuss, 1860 does not merit setting aside the Principle of Homonymy, and I object to the use of the plenary power to conserve it.

(2) Enrico Schwabe

Münchhausenstrasse 21, D-81247 Munich, Germany

The name for the European Miocene species *Chiton lepidus* Reuss, 1860 is indeed a junior primary homonym of *Chiton lepidus* Gould, 1859, the name for a Recent Indo-Pacific species. However, as I made clear in para. 4 of my application, neither species has been included in the original genus since 1883, when Rochebrune placed *lepidus* Reuss in *Tonicia* Gray, 1840. Shortly after, Pilsbry (1893) also removed *lepidus* Gould from *Chiton* (and placed it in *Ischnochiton* Gray, 1847). Under Article 23.9.5 of the Code, the junior of two homonymous names should not automatically be renamed if the names have not been treated as congeneric since 1899: a case should be brought to the Commission while existing usage of both names is maintained, and this is what I have done.

The senior homonym *lepidus* Gould, 1859 has not been used as a valid name for more than a decade and the species is known as *Lepidozona luzonica* (Sowerby, 1842). The junior homonym *lepidus* Reuss, 1860 has been in use since its publication and has no junior synonyms. To rename *lepidus* Reuss at this late stage because of a long out-of-date primary homonymy would cause unnecessary confusion, and anyway the earlier name would always have to be cited. I urge the Commission to approve my proposal.

It is pointless to argue over trifles but nevertheless I point out that in para. 3 of my application I cited nine publications by nine (not 'six independent') authors to demonstrate the usage of *lepidus* Reuss. Since publication of the case I have found an additional three publications in which Reuss's name has been cited (a list of these works is held by the Commission Secretariat).